

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

JUSTIN BLAKE,

Case No: 22-cv-0970

Plaintiff,

v.

DAVID BETH, et al.,

Defendants.

**PLAINTIFF’S CIVIL LOCAL RULE 7(h) EXPEDITED NON-DISPOSITIVE  
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO  
DEFENDANTS’ MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT – ECF No. 81 IN EXCESS  
OF THE PAGE LIMITS SET FORTH IN CIVIL LOCAL RULE 56(b)(8)(A) AND TO  
FILE STATEMENTS OF FACT IN EXCESS OF NUMERICAL LIMIT SET FORTH  
IN CIVIL LOCAL RULE 56(b)(2)(B)(ii)**

NOW COMES Plaintiff, Justin Blake, by his attorneys, and for his brief in opposition to Defendants David Beth, County of Kenosha, Kyle Bissonnette, Jacob DiCello, Gloria Galvan, Dereemeyun Haynes, Jeremy May, and Wisconsin Municipal Mutual Insurance Company, (collectively, “Defendants”, unless otherwise noted) respectfully move the Court, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7(h) for an Order permitting them to file its brief in opposition to Defendants motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 81) in excess of the page limit as set forth in Civil Local Rule 56(b)(8)(A) and to file statements of fact in excess of the numerical limit set forth in Civil Local Rule 56(b)(2)(A)(ii). In support thereof, the Plaintiff state as follows:

1. Plaintiff Blake has made every effort to prepare a concise brief in support of his anticipated Opposition to Defendants Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 81), in accordance with Civil Local Rule 56(b)(8)(A) and concise Statements of Fact in accordance

with Civil Local Rule 56(b)(2)(A)(ii). However, due to the nature of the Defendant's arguments to the claims in its brief, the Plaintiff require additional pages to argue against the numerous arguments which require substantial analysis of relatively complex constitutional or statutory issues.

2. Defendants filed a forty-five page Brief in their Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 82) and 187 statements of fact (ECF No. 83) as approved by this court. (ECF No. 68)

3. Given Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 81), the number of arguments that have been raised, the Plaintiff anticipate that they will also exceed the 30-page limit established in Civil Local 56(b)(8)(A) and the 100-statements of fact limit established in Civil Local Rule 56(b)(2)(A)(ii).

4. Because of the nature of the arguments raised by Defendant's in opposition to the claims, we respectfully request that this Court permit the Plaintiff to submit its opposition brief to Defendant's motion for summary judgment that exceeds the 30-page limit as set forth in Civil Local Civil Local 56(b)(8)(A) and to submit statements of fact that exceed the 100 numerical limit set forth in Civil Local Rule 56(b)(2)(A)(ii).

4. The Plaintiff respectfully request that the Court enter an Order granting them leave to file a brief of up to 45 pages and up to 150 statements of fact.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, Justin Blake, respectfully request leave to file a principal brief in opposition to Defendant's motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 81) that exceeds the limit set forth in Civil Local Rule 56(b)(8)(A) but that is no longer than 45 pages, and to file statements of fact that exceed the limit set forth in Civil Local Rule 56(b)(2)(A)(ii) but no more than 150.

Dated this April 8, 2025.

**MOTLEY LEGAL SERVICES**

By: s/Kimberley Cy. Motley  
Kimberley Cy. Motley, SBN 1047193  
PO Box 1433  
Matthews, NC 28106  
(704) 763-5413 (phone)  
[kmotley@motleylegal.com](mailto:kmotley@motleylegal.com)